

AMENDMENTS AND REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, and 26-28 remain in this application. Claims 3, 6, 11, 13-25, and 29 were cancelled in a previous amendment. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

1. Response to Objections to the Claims

Claims 4-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 4, 5 and 7-9 recite the limitation "piece of information." Claims 1 has been amended to amended the limitation "a natural-language processor configured to process the mode of information to extract a piece of information from the database" as recommended by the Examiner. The applicant thanks for the Examiner for the suggested amendments.

2. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,434,520) in view of Pustejovsky et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0037328A1). Pustejovsky was filed on Dec. 19, 2000 and claims priority to provisional application nos. 60/191,883 filed on Mar. 23, 2000 and 60/228,616 filed on Aug. 28, 2000.

The pending application was filed on Sept. 26, 2001 and claims priority to provisional application no. 60/236,650 which was filed on Sept. 29, 2000 and discloses the resolution of

ambiguities and the categorical hierarchy structure at pages 6 and 7. Because provisional application no. 60/236,650 was filed before the filing date of Pustejovsky, the applicant respectfully submits that Pustejovsky may not be prior art depending upon the contents of provisional application nos. 60/228,616 and 60/191,883 which were filed before Sept. 29, 2000. Because these references are not available on the USPTO public PAIR system the applicant cannot determine if Pustejovsky is prior art. The applicant respectfully requests that provisional application nos. 60/228,616 and 60/191,883 be made available to determine if Pustejovsky is prior art.

The Examiner stated that Kanevsky teaches a handheld personal assistant operated by a user comprising a categorizer configured to store a plurality of data items in a database organized by one or more categories of information and that Pustejovsky teaches a categorical hierarchy structure.

Claim 1 was amended to add the limitation that the categorizer is configured to store a plurality of data items in a database organized by categories of information that are grouped into a calendar category, an address book category and a to-do-list category. The applicant submits that Kanevsky does not teach or disclose storing data in a database organized by a calendar category, an address book category and a to-do-list category wherein each category of information includes one or more subcategories of information that are linked in a hierarchical structure. Specifically, neither Kanevsky nor Pustejovsky disclose the calendar, address book and to-do-list organization. Although Pustejovsky discloses categories of information and subcategories this is done in terms of obtaining answers to user queries and not the storage of

data into specific subcategories. “An embodiment of the present invention may return relevant documents as answers to a query, possibly ranked according to relevance, but more importantly, categorized dynamically into relevant classifications and subclassifications, as motivated (or directed) by the content of the query.” (Pustejovsky, Paragraph 0033, emphasis added.) Thus, Pustejovsky discloses the retrieval of information in the form of categories and subcategories, but not the storage of information into the categories and subcategories that are linked in a hierarchical structure. Thus, the applicant submits that this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references.

Claim 1 was also amended to add the limitation that the context processor maintains the storage of data items with the determined category of information until a new category is detected and the natural language process is configured to extract a piece of information from the determined category of the database. The applicant also submits that this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and for the same reasons are not unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Pustejovsky.

Claims 5, 7-10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Pustejovsky and Sasai. The Examiner states that Sasai discloses a list consisting of an address book and a to-do-list. Like Kanevsky and Pustejovsky, Sasai does not disclose or suggest the storage of information into the categories and subcategories that are linked in a hierarchical structure. Claims 5, 7-10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and for the same reasons discussed above, the applicant submits that claims 5, 7-10 and 12 are not invalid.

Claims 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasai in view of Pustejovsky. Again, the applicant submits that Pustejovsky may not be prior art to the pending application.

Like claim 1, claim 26 was amended to add the limitations of storing a plurality of data items in a database organized categories of information that are grouped into a calendar category, an address book category and a to-do-list category wherein each category of information includes one or more subcategories of information. Claim 26 was also amended to change the step of maintaining the storing of the data items in the determined category of information and the extracting of the piece of information until a new category of information is determined. In addition, claim 26 was amended to change the format of “resolve the ambiguity” to “resolving the ambiguity.” Claim 26 was also amended to add the limitation maintaining the storing of the data items and the extracting of the piece of information in the determined category of information until a new category of information is determined.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Pustejovsky only discloses the retrieval of information from categories and subcategories. The applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose the storage of information into the categories and subcategories that are linked in a hierarchical structure. The applicant submits that claim 26 is not unpatentable over Sasai in view of Pustejovsky. Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26 and for the same reasons, are not unpatentable over Sasai in view of Pustejovsky.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above described amendments be made part of the official record in the present application, and respectfully submit that support for the claim

amendments and is present in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed, and that no new matter has been added.

If there are any shortages, the Examiner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account Number 04-0822.

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

Dated: May 22, 2006

By:



Paul K. Tomita
Reg. No.: 43,193